



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,608	12/02/2003	Hiroyuki Kometani	380-45	3708

23117 7590 07/27/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

SERGEANT, RABON A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,608	KOMETANI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rabon Sergeant	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/973,747.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The word, "petroselinic", has been spelled incorrectly.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagio et al. ('104) in view of Laas et al. ('044) and Nakamura et al. ('034) and Hannah et al. ('659).

Hagio et al. disclose the use of salts of cycloamidines, such as applicants' claimed DBU, DBN, and DBD, as catalysts for polyurethane compositions. Patentees further disclose that the aforementioned salts can be produced from the reaction of the aforementioned cycloamidines with unsaturated acids, such as crotonic acid, acrylic acid, and ricinoleic acid. See abstract; column 2; and column 3, lines 14-19.

Art Unit: 1711

4. In addition to the teachings of Hagio et al, Nakamura et al. disclose at column 5, lines 1-40, especially lines 1-4, that salts of DBU were known catalysts for polyurethanes, and Laas et al. disclose at column 4, line 65 through column 5, line 13 that bicyclic amidines corresponding to those of applicants were known catalysts for polyurethane yielding coating compositions.

Though the aforementioned references fail to specifically recite the use of the catalysts within two-component isocyanate based systems, the use of salts of DBU and DBN within such systems was known at the time of invention, as evidenced by Hannah et al. at column 4, line 65 through column 5, line 27. Furthermore, since the salt forms in a one to one ratio of catalyst to acid, applicants' claimed ratio limitations are considered to be satisfied.

5. Therefore, in view of the aforementioned teachings, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to utilize salts derived from unsaturated acids and cyclic amidines, such as DBU, DBN, and DBD, in their art recognized capacity as catalysts for polyurethane and isocyanate based polymeric systems, and that it further would have been obvious to utilize the salts in virtually any type of polyurethane yielding system, including two-component systems. Lastly, the position is taken that the use of virtually any unsaturated acid to block the catalyst would have been obvious in view of the teachings of the references.

6. Applicants' response of May 12, 2005 has been considered; however, the response is insufficient to overcome the prior art rejections. Firstly, it is by no means clear that applicants' claims exclude the use of blocked polyisocyanates; the method claims merely specify that the polyisocyanate is reacted with a polyol in the presence of the claimed catalyst, and the position is taken that such is the case even when a blocked polyisocyanate is utilized. After deblocking, the resulting polyisocyanate reacts with a polyol. Secondly, despite applicants' arguments, the

Art Unit: 1711

position is taken that the prior art when fairly considered renders obvious the use of an unsaturated acid blocked bicyclic tertiary amine catalyst. In the instant case, the evidence of obviousness outweighs the evidence of non-obviousness. It is not seen that applicants have provided showings commensurate in scope with the claims that rebut the *prima facie* case of obviousness. One of ordinary skill in the art, in the course of routine experimentation, would have been able to select suitable acid blocked catalysts yielding optimum results, in terms of such properties as pot-life and viscosity increase.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

R. Sergent
July 25, 2005


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER